DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 397 RC 013 665

AUTHOR Wilson, Alfred P.; Singer, Jerry D.
TITLE High School Attendance Policies in the State of Kansas.
PUB DATE 15 Nov 82
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Rural and Small School Conference (4th, Manhattan, KS, November 15, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Adults; *Attendance; *Attitudes; *Board of Education Policy; Boards of Education; *Comparative Analysis; *High Schools; High School Students; *Leaders; School Size; Student Attitudes; Student Government; Teacher Associations; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas

ABSTRACT

Questionnaires were distributed to student body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organization, principals, and school board presidents of each of 80 randomly selected Kansas high schools (with representation from each of 4 size categories) to determine how various groups affected by attendance policies perceived the characteristics of those policies. Sixty-two of the schools had previously returned their attendance policies and a panel of experts found 28 characteristics used in the attendance policies; these characteristics then comprised the questionnaire. Sample characteristics included "Parents are allowed to excuse any student absence," "The school determines which student absences are classified as excused," and "Poor student attendance leads to poor academic achievement." Significant differences were found among how the four groups perceived various characteristics of attendance policies. In 19 of 20 instances where there was a significant difference between perceptions, the difference was between a student under the jurisdiction of the guidelines and an adult not under the jurisdiction of the guidelines. The greatest number of significant differences was found between student body presidents and building representatives. School board presidents had the greatest amount of differences of any group. No significant difference existed in perceptions within individual groups when broken down by school size classification. (BRR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223397

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alfred P. Wilson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

DEC 1982
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

HIGH SCHOOL ATTENDANCE POLICIES IN THE STATE OF KANSAS*

by

Alfred P. Wilson & Jerry D. Singer

Dr. Wilson is Professor of Educational Management at Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506

Dr. Singer is a principal in the Salina, Kansas schools.

*Presented at the fourth annual Rural and Small School Conference, November 15, 1982, Manhattan, Kansas.

RC 013665

INTRODUCTION

Absenteeism has been a mounting problem that has developed into a burden for industry and our schools. Workers are increasingly viewing absenteeism as a right, and this attitude is filtering down to school children. Sick leave has lost its initial purpose of being a benefit that most workers can set aside for insurance against long-term illness, and is now often used to escape the normal routine of work.

This attitude has had devastating effects in the business sector. Cruikshank (4) states that "for the overall economy, the cost of no-shows is reckoned in tens of millions of lost man-hours every week in idle machinery and unused plant facilities, in materials spoilage, and in delayed shipments to customers, among other things." These expenses resulting from administrative lost time, decreased productivity and sick leave costs have been passed on to the consumer, thus causing society to absorb the loss created by the absent employee.

Now absenteeism from schools is generating huge social costs, particularly as it's related to juvenile crime. Elliot Lee, Gil Sewall, and Diane Sherman (16) reported that "truants cost Overland, California, millions of dollars in vandalism and led to shocking rates of juvenile crime." There are also the long range effects of having large numbers of individuals entering the work force without adequate formal education.

These concerns have led legislators to enact compulsory education laws in all of the states except Mississippi. The legislation passed by the state of Kansas required compulsory attendance of students between ages seven (7) and sixteen (16). It has normally been left up to the individual school district to develop their own attendance policies for enforcement of the statute for both the 7-16 year old age group and for those students beyond that age.

School districts throughout the state of Kansas have developed their attendance policies to be enforced by the building level administrators. Numerous administrative hours are spent enforcing the attendance policies developed by the individual school districts and dealing with the many problems that are associated with poor student attendance.

Purposes and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine the characteristics of attendance policies used in high schools in the state of Kansas. Once this was determined the various groups affected by the policies were surveyed to determine their perceptions of these characteristics.

Population and Sample Size

The population of this study included student body presidents, building representatives of the teachers organizations, principals, and school board presidents. Twenty high schools from each of the high school size classifications 6A, 5A, 4A, and one group made up of 3A, 2A, and 1A were randomly selected by strata. The questionnaire was distributed to the student body president, building representative of the teacher organization, principal and school board president of each of the 80 randomly selected high schools.

Definition of Terms

The High School is a U.S. secondary school for all of or portions of g ades 9-12, covering the 15-18 year old age group (13).

The Attendance Policy is the local school district policy laying down conditions of attendance at school.

6A High Schools are those 32 high schools in the state of Kansas with the largest enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

5A High Schools are those 32 high schools in the state of Kansas

with the 33rd through 64th largest enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

4A High Schools are those 64 high schools in the state of Kansas with the 65th through 128th largest enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

3A High Schools are those 64 high schools in the state of Kansas with the 129th through 192nd largest enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

2A High Schools are those 64 high schools in the state of Kansas with the 193rd through 256th largest enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

1A High Schools are those high schools in the state of Kansas with the 257th through all remaining enrollments in grades 10, 11, and 12 as determined by the September 15 Kansas State Department of Education Official Enrollment Count.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Attendance Characteristics

Sixty-two (62) of eighty randomly sampled schools returned attendance policies to the initiator of the study. A panel of three experts found twenty-eight (28) characteristics that were used in the attendance policies. Listed below are the characteristics found.

1. Parents are allowed to excuse any student absence.
2. The school determines which student absences are classified as excused.

3. Parents must contact the school by telephone to excuse student absences.

4. Parents can contact the school by either telephone or written message to excuse student absences.

5. The school contacts the parents of an absent student if they fail to contact the school.

6. Absences not excused within a specified number of days are classified as unexcused.

7. Students are required to attend a specific number of hours to receive credit for a course.

8. Suspensions from school are used to penalize students who are truant.

9. Students are not allowed to make up work missed due to unexcused absences.

10. Students are required to make up time missed due to unexcused absences.

11. Poor student attendance leads to poor academic achievement.

12. Poor student attendance leads to a low level of responsibility.

13. Attendance is the responsibility of the student and his/her parents.

14. Students lose credit for courses and can even be removed from the educational program after a set number of unexcused absences.

15. Schools notify the home after the student has missed a specific number of days.

16. Poor student attendance leads to poor work attendance in later years.

17. Students are required to provide a doctor's note after a specific number of consecutive absences.

18. It is the student's responsibility to obtain work missed due to excused absences.

19. Students with poor attendance patterns are required to attend an attendance workshop to remain in school.

20. Students are excused for personal illness.

21. Students are excused for family emergencies such as serious illness or death.

22. Students are excused for medical and legal appointments.

23. Students are excused when parents need them at home.

24. Students are excused when they need to work at an outside job.

25. Students are excused for personal errands.

26. Students are excused to take prearranged vacations with parents.

27. Incentive programs are used to encourage good student attendance.

28. A specific number of tardies count as an unexcused absence.

Response to the Questionnaire

A total of seventy-two (72) questionnaires were returned from high school principals; seventy-one (71) usable questionnaires were returned by building representatives of the teacher organization; seventy-one (71) usable questionnaires were returned by student body presidents; and sixty-two (62) usable questionnaires were returned by school board presidents.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF RETURNS BY AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility	No. Surveyed	No. Returned	% Returned
Teacher Representative	80	71	88.75
Student Body President	80	71	88.75
Principal	80	72	90.00
School Board President	80	62	77.50

Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 show a breakdown of the school classifications by size surveyed.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION BY SIZE
STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT RESPONSES

Classification	Number	Percent
6A	17	85
5A	18	90
4A	20	100
3A, 2A, 1A	16	80

6A is the 32 largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
5A is the 33rd - 64th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
4A is the 65th - 128th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
3A, 2A, 1A are the 129th and below largest High School enrollments remaining.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION BY SIZE
BUILDING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION

Classification	Number	Percent
6A	17	85
5A	18	90
4A	20	100
3A, 2A, 1A	16	80

6A is the 32 largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
5A is the 33rd - 64th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
4A is the 65th - 128th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
3A, 2A, 1A are the 129th and below largest High School enrollments remaining.

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION BY SIZE
PRINCIPAL

Classification	Number	Percent
6A	18	90
5A	18	90
4A	20	100
3A, 2A, 1A	16	80

6A is the 32 largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
5A is the 33rd - 64th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
4A is the 65th - 128th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
3A, 2A, 1A are the 129th and below largest High School enrollments remaining.

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION BY SIZE
SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENT

Classification	Number	Percent
6A	15	75
5A	16	80
4A	17	85
3A, 2A, 1A	14	70

6A is the 32 largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
5A is the 33rd - 64th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
4A is the 65th - 128th largest High School enrollments, grades 10, 11, and 12.
3A, 2A, 1A are the 129th and below largest High School enrollments remaining.

STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS, BUILDING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION, PRINCIPALS, AND SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS PERCEPTIONS

Using the one way analysis of variance procedure, two (2) hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance. The hypotheses and the results of the analysis are shown below.

Hypothesis Number 1

There is no significant difference between how the study body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organizations, school board presidents, and principals perceived the various characteristics found in attendance policies of the state of Kansas.

The F ratios found using the analysis of variance technique are listed in Table 6. Eleven of the twenty-eight characteristics showed a significant F ratio.

TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR POSITION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Characteristic	F	
1	30.15	*
2	19.00	*
3	2.08	
4	2.74	
5	15.54	*
6	5.29	
7	4.17	
8	0.63	
9	11.73	*
10	3.47	
11	10.35	*
12	14.34	*
13	3.63	
14	5.54	
15	7.04	
16	6.00	
17	6.80	
18	3.91	
19	0.95	
20	4.12	
21	0.80	
22	11.77	*
23	21.02	*
24	24.38	*
25	22.14	*
26	11.19	*
27	4.86	
28	4.35	

* Significantly different at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

Table 7 shows the mean scores of perceptions of student body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organization, principals, and school board presidents towards the 28 characteristics of attendance policies in the State of Kansas.

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES FOR POSITION OF THE RESPONDENT

Characteristic	Student Body President	Teacher Organization Representative	Principal	School Board President
1 *	4.25	2.03	1.78	2.47
2 *	4.31	5.97	6.04	5.90
3	4.82	4.99	5.32	4.52
4	5.59	4.72	4.94	5.26
5 *	4.13	5.30	5.24	6.21
6	5.39	6.24	6.25	6.05
7	5.00	6.03	5.44	5.61
8	3.15	3.46	3.25	3.56
9 *	3.94	5.21	4.99	3.31
10	4.24	4.97	4.83	5.23
11 *	5.06	6.20	6.07	5.73
12 *	4.92	6.21	6.01	6.08
13	6.08	6.55	6.11	6.53
14	4.66	5.68	5.14	4.55
15	5.31	5.87	5.63	6.37
16	4.73	5.45	5.71	5.31
17	4.08	5.11	5.19	4.40
18	6.22	6.70	6.61	6.35
19	3.72	3.89	4.04	4.11
20	6.00	5.32	5.32	5.94
21	6.73	6.54	6.57	6.63
22 *	6.56	5.17	5.72	5.97
23 *	4.94	2.83	3.08	3.52
24 *	3.72	1.89	1.85	2.11
25 *	3.94	2.17	2.26	2.19
26 *	5.49	3.89	4.99	4.61
27	5.41	4.61	5.39	5.52
28	4.34	5.35	4.56	4.97

* Significant difference at .05 level

Tables 8-18 give the F ratio between student body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organization, principals, and school board presidents according to the Schiffé Test.

TABLE 8

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 1

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	24.76 *
Principal/Teacher	0.25
Principal/Board President	1.79
Student/Teacher	19.87 *
Student/Board President	10.86 *
Teacher/Board President	0.72

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 9

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 2

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	13.86 *
Principal/Teacher	0.02
Principal/Board President	0.08
Student/Teacher	12.67 *
Student/Board President	10.86 *
Teacher/Board President	0.02

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 10

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 5

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	4.69
Principal/Teacher	0.01
Principal/Board President	3.37
Student/Teacher	5.17
Student/Board President	15.32 *
Teacher/Board President	2.95

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 11

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 9

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	2.84
Principal/Teacher	0.13
Principal/Board President	6.87
Student/Teacher	4.17
Student/Board President	0.98
Teacher/Board President	8.78 *

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 12

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 11

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	6.82
Principal/Teacher	0.11
Principal/Board President	0.73
Student/Teacher	8.58 *
Student/Board President	2.76
Teacher/Board President	1.37

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 13

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 12

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	8.17
Principal/Teacher	0.26
Principal/Board President	0.28
Student/Teacher	11.28 *
Student/Board President	8.51
Teacher/Board President	0.11

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 14

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 22

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	4.19
Principal/Teacher	1.81
Principal/Board President	0.33
Student/Teacher	11.42 *
Student/Board President	1.94
Teacher/Board President	3.49

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 15

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 23

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	13.70 *
Principal/Teacher	0.25
Principal/Board President	0.69
Student/Teacher	18.00 *
Student/Board President	7.47
Teacher/Board President	1.72

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 16

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 24

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	18.04 *
Principal/Teacher	0.01
Principal/Board President	0.34
Student/Teacher	17.16 *
Student/Board President	12.30 *
Teacher/Board President	0.24

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 17

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 25

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	13.20 *
Principal/Teacher	0.04
Principal/Board President	0.02
Student/Teacher	14.63 *
Student/Board President	13.26 *
Teacher/Board President	0.00

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

TABLE 18

SCHEFFE TEST F RATIOS FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISONS
OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS
CHARACTERISTIC 26

Pairwise Comparison	F Ratio
Principal/Student	1.06
Principal/Teacher	4.97
Principal/Board President	0.53
Student/Teacher	10.54 *
Student/Board President	2.95
Teacher/Board President	2.01

* Significant difference at the .05 level
df= 3,272
Region of Rejection: F greater than or equal to 8.55

Table 19 gives a summary of where significant differences actually occured between student body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organization, principals, and school board presidents according to the Scheffé Test.

TABLE 19

SIGNIFICANT F RATIOS USING SCHEFFE TEST FOR PAIRWISE COMPARISON OF POSITIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS

Characteristic	P/S	P/T	P/BP	S/T	S/BP	T/BP
1	*			*	*	
2	*			*	*	
5					*	
9						*
11				*		
12				*		
22				*		
23	*			*		
24	*			*	*	
25	*			*	*	
26				*		

* Indicates a significant difference at the .05 level

When the 28 characteristics are ranked by mean scores, as to their importance (least to greatest) the four comparison groups each rank the areas differently. Table 20 shows the rank order of importance (least to greatest) of each characteristic by the four positions of respondents.

TABLE 20

RANK ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINED BY MEAN SCORES

Characteristic	Student Body President	Teacher Organization Representative	Principal	School Board President
1	9	2	1	3
2	10	21	24	19
3	14	11	15.5	9
4	21	9	9	14
5	7	15	14	24
6	20	25	27	22
7	17	22	18	17
8	1	5	5	6
9	4.5	14	10.5	4
10	8	10	8	13
11	18	23	25	18
12	15	24	23	23
13	23	27	26	27
14	12	19	12	10
15	19	20	20	26
16	13	18	21	15
17	6	12	13	8
18	24	28	28	25
19	2.5	6.5	6	7
20	23	16	15.5	20
21	26	26	19	28
22	25	13	22	21
23	16	4	4	5
24	2.5	1	2	1
25	4.5	3	3	2
26	22	6.5	10.5	11
27	21	8	17	16
28	11	17	7	12

The data provided on tables 6-20 gives considerable insight into how persons affected by the characteristics found in attendance policies in the State of Kansas perceive them. There was consensus found among the four groups on seventeen of the twenty-eight characteristics in question.

Each of the four groups that were questioned felt that it was the responsibility of the parents to contact the school officials when their son or daughter was absent from school. According to the responses, parents should be able to fulfill this responsibility either by written notes or by personal telephone contacts. It was interesting to note that the principals and building representative of the teacher organization were more strongly in favor of the contact being made by a telephone conference rather than a written note.

The data in response to characteristic 6 shows that each of the affected parties surveyed felt strongly that absences not excused within a specified number of days should be classified as unexcused. The principal and teacher groups felt more strongly in favor of this than did the student body president and school board president groups.

The response to characteristic 7 showed that all groups felt a specific number of hours should be attended in order for a student to receive credit for a course. The student groups assigned the least amount of importance to this concept, but their reaction was still positive.

None of the four affected groups surveyed felt that suspensions from school should be a tool used to penalize students who are truant. It was of interest to note that even though the concept was not accepted, school board presidents were the least resistant group.

The penalty that was more acceptable to each of the groups was that students should be required to make up time missed due to unexcused absences. The data returned on this characteristic again showed that school board presidents felt most strongly in favor of it. The student body president group responded positively towards this characteristic, but they were less receptive to it than any other group surveyed.

All of the groups surveyed felt very strongly that attendance is the responsibility of the student and his/her parents. The teacher and school board president groups gave almost identical responses to this idea. In a similar fashion the student and principal groups had very similar reactions. Even though the responses were not significantly different, the teacher and school board president groups had stronger feelings toward this idea than did the student and principal groups.

Each of the groups surveyed were in agreement with the idea that students could lose credit for courses and even be removed from the educational program after a set number of unexcused absences. This positive reaction is consistent with the response to the idea that students must attend a set number of hours to receive credit for a course, but is inconsistent with the negative reaction to suspending students for truancy. The teacher group which is in closest contact with the students in dealing with this problem had the strongest positive reaction to this form of penalty. Although school board presidents were agreeable to it, they displayed the least amount of acceptance.

When a student has missed a specific number of days, each group felt that the school should notify his/her parents. There was strong positive reaction to this characteristic shown by all groups. The school board president group was the most positive in their reaction while the student group reacted the least favorably towards the idea.

The idea that poor student attendance leads to poor work attendance in later years was agreed upon positively by all groups. The principal group, which commonly uses this as a reason for students to improve their attendance pattern, reacted most positively towards this concept. The student groups had the least positive reaction to this belief.

All groups reacted somewhat positively to the characteristic that students be required to provide a doctor's note after a specific number of consecutive absences. The principal and teacher groups felt that it was a good idea while the school board president and student groups reaction was just a little over the point of it not mattering to them. The principal groups, which usually spends considerable time working on the attendance problem, had the strongest positive reaction towards this characteristic.

A very strong positive response was received on the characteristic that students must be responsible to obtain work missed due to excused absenses. The teacher group, which must spend considerable time assisting students in their effort to make up missed work, felt most strongly towards this. While teachers had the strongest positive reaction, all groups felt that it was of extreme importance.

The idea that students with poor attendance patterns should be required to attend an attendance workshop to remain in school was not really accepted or rejected by any group. This characteristic was found to be used in only one of the sixty-two (62) attendance policies reviewed. It appears that the four groups have had so little contact with such a program that they could not react strongly one way or another to it.

Personal illness was accepted as a valid excuse for student absences by all four of the groups surveyed. It is of interest to note that the principal and teacher groups mean score was exactly the same. This score showed a positive reaction, but not as high as that of students and school board presidents.

One of the strongest positive reactions about any of the characteristics came concerning the idea that students should be

excused for family emergencies such as serious illness or death. This reaction was even stronger than that for the idea that students be excused for personal illness. It is of significant interest to note that all groups rated what is usually an emotional problem as more important than what is usually a physical problem.

Incentive programs used to encourage good student attendance were positively supported by all four groups surveyed. While only two of the sixty-two attendance policies reviewed made use of incentive programs, all groups surveyed seemed to think that this would be a positive means to improve student attendance patterns. The strongest proponent of such a program was the school board president group, with the student and teacher groups following very close behind.

The idea that a specific number of tardies count as an unexcused absence was accepted positively by all four groups surveyed. Even though the response was positive, it was not very strong with any of the groups. The teacher and school board president groups had the strongest reaction. The student and principal groups reacted just a little higher than it not really mattering one way or another.

On eleven of the twenty-eight characteristics, significant differences were found to exist between two or more of the groups surveyed.

The first significant difference in reaction of the groups surveyed toward a characteristic was on if parents should be allowed to excuse any student absence. The student group had a slight positive reaction to this idea while each of the other three groups reacted very strongly against it. The principal and teacher groups reacted most strongly against the idea, while the school board president group was a little less resistant. This concept did not fare well with any of the groups primarily responsible for developing attendance policies.

The characteristic that the school determines which student absences are classified as excused was also met with significant differences in perceptions. Again the reaction of the teacher, school board president and principal groups was very positive towards this idea. The reaction of the student groups was slightly above the point of not really caring, but significantly different from the other three groups. The student group mean score of this characteristic was similar to the mean score on parents being able to excuse any absence. In both cases they were slightly positive about the idea, but they seemed to feel there was a better solution to the problem of distinguishing excused absences.

When surveyed about should the school contact the parent of an absent student if they fail to contact the school, the student body president group and the school board president group differed significantly. The reaction of all four of the groups was positive concerning this concept. The student body president group was only slightly in favor of this being done, while the school board president group reacted strongly toward it. The teacher and principal groups were strongly in favor of the idea, but they did not differ significantly from the other two groups.

The only time that any of the adult groups differed significantly was over the issue of whether students should be allowed to make up work missed due to unexcused absences. Teachers reacted strongly to the idea that make up work should not be given to students for unexcused absences, while school board presidents seemed to feel that the missed work should be given to the student. The principal group reacted similarly to the teacher group, but their mean score was not significantly different from the school board presidents. The student group reaction

was slightly in favor of the missed work being given for unexcused absences, but it did not differ dignificantly from any other group. It is interesting to note that the school board president reaction to this form of punishment for unexcused absences is somewhat inconsistent with their other hard line feelings towards dealing with truancy problems.

The student and teacher groups differed signficantly over the feeling that poor student attendance leads to poor academic achievement. The teacher group responded with a very strong positive reaction to this statement. The student group agreed that the statement was true, but their reaction was not nearly as positive. The school board president and principal groups each felt strongly positive towards this statement, but they did not differ signficantly from the other two groups.

An additional area where a signficant difference was found between the student and teacher groups was over the statement that poor student attendance leads to a low level of responsibility. Again the teacher response to the statement was very much in agreement with it. The student group responded positively towards the statement, but not nearly as strong as did the teachers. In a pattern similar to that found in the last characteristic, the school board president and principal groups reacted strongly in agreement with the statement. The reaction of these two groups failed to differ significantly from either that of the student or teacher groups.

For a third time the student and teacher groups differed significantly in their perceptions on if students should be excused for medical and legal appointments. The reaction of the student group was strongly in favor of this concept. Teachers responded

positively towards the issue, but not with the intensity of the students. The principal and school board president groups also felt strongly that students should be excused for these appointments. Their reaction failed to differ significantly from the teacher and student groups.

On the issue of whether students should be excused when their parents needed them at home the teacher and principal groups differed significantly from the student group. Principals and teachers had very negative feelings towards excusing students when needed at home. The students felt that, should the need arise, they should be excused to help their parents. The school board president group was opposed to the idea, but their mean score did not differ significantly from any of the other three groups.

Significant differences were found to exist between the perceptions of all of the adult groups when compared to the student group about the concept that students should be excused to work at an outside job. Teacher, school board president, and principal groups were all vigorously opposed to students being excused for this. Student group reaction was slightly opposed to the issue, but far from the opposition displayed by the other three groups.

The same type of reaction was found about the issue of if students should be excused to run personal errands. The student group reacted with a slightly negative response towards this happening. The groups consisting of teachers, school board presidents, and principals were all highly opposed to these absences being excused. It was interesting to note that the negative response to students being excused to run personal errands was not as strong as that towards students being excused to work at an outside job.

The final characteristic where a significant difference was found to exist was on if students should be excused to take prearranged vacations with parents. The teacher group was slightly opposed to this idea while the student group felt that these absences should definitely be excused. The principal and school board president groups were very much in favor of excusing students to take prearranged vacations with parents, but their response did not significantly differ from that of the teachers.

Hypothesis Number 2

There is no significant difference between how the various characteristics found in the attendance policies of high schools in the state of Kansas are perceived within individual groups as broken down by school classification (6A; 5A; 4A; and group made up of 3A, 2A, and 1A).

The F ratios found using the analysis of variance technique are listed in Tables 21-25. At no time was there a significant difference in perceptions of the twenty-eight characteristics when comparing the individual groups by school size.

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR SCHOOL SIZE
STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT RESPONDENTS

Characteristic	F Ratio
1	1.70
2	0.97
3	0.31
4	1.24
5	2.89
6	0.19
7	0.91
8	0.90
9	0.92
10	2.12
11	1.96
12	0.85
13	0.69
14	1.02
15	0.71
16	0.25
17	1.66
18	1.00
19	0.98
20	0.38
21	1.37
22	0.82
23	0.59
24	0.80
25	0.35
26	2.25
27	0.75
28	0.10

df= 3,67 Region of Rejection: F greater or equal to 8.57

TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR SCHOOL SIZE OF BUILDING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION

Characteristic	F Ratio
1	0.29
2	1.11
3	1.30
4	0.77
5	0.95
6	1.14
7	1.79
8	0.20
9	0.58
10	0.02
11	2.10
12	0.96
13	1.12
14	0.77
15	0.08
16	0.59
17	0.80
18	0.47
19	0.36
20	0.43
21	0.47
22	0.65
23	0.92
24	1.51
25	0.73
26	1.90
27	2.97
28	1.57

df= 3,67
Region of Rejection: F greater or equal to 8.57

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR SCHOOL SIZE PRINCIPAL

Characteristic	F Ratio
1	0.56
2	0.23
3	1.73
4	0.59
5	2.73
6	0.53
7	0.51
8	2.53
9	1.49
10	0.51
11	0.18
12	0.34
13	1.07
14	1.45
15	1.88
16	0.63
17	0.75
18	0.22
19	1.48
20	1.06
21	0.54
22	0.37
23	0.23
24	0.55
25	1.23
26	0.82
27	1.61
28	1.47

df= 3,67
Region of Rejection: F greater or equal to 8.57

TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR SCHOOL SIZE
SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS

Characteristic	F Ratio
1	0.99
2	0.68
3	3.48
4	1.18
5	0.38
6	3.66
7	0.39
8	0.43
9	0.92
10	0.34
11	0.54
12	0.70
13	2.45
14	0.95
15	0.99
16	1.53
17	0.27
18	6.34
19	1.01
20	0.34
21	0.31
22	0.42
23	1.32
24	1.04
25	2.31
26	2.21
27	0.48
28	1.54

df= 3,58
Region of Rejection: F greater or equal to 8.57

Tables 25-28 show the mean scores of perceptions within the individual groups as broken down by school classification (6A; 5A; 4A; and the group consisting of 3A, 2A, and 1A) towards the 28 characteristics found in attendance policies in

the State of Kansas.

TABLE 25

MEAN SCORES FOR THE SCHOOL CLASSIFICATIONS
STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	3.82	4.50	4.90	3.63
2	3.88	4.28	4.15	5.00
3	4.65	5.00	5.05	4.50
4	5.41	5.06	5.85	6.06
5	3.29	4.39	5.00	3.63
6	5.53	5.28	5.55	5.19
7	4.35	4.94	5.30	5.38
8	3.06	2.61	3.45	3.50
9	4.59	3.61	3.55	4.13
10	3.41	4.33	4.25	5.00
11	5.18	4.89	4.50	5.81
12	5.18	4.78	4.50	5.31
13	6.29	6.28	5.95	5.81
14	4.88	4.28	4.35	5.25
15	5.29	5.72	5.10	5.13
16	4.82	4.89	4.45	4.81
17	3.41	4.00	4.65	4.19
18	3.65	6.17	6.50	5.81
19	3.53	3.56	3.90	3.88
20	5.94	6.28	5.85	5.94
21	6.76	6.89	6.85	6.38
22	6.47	6.33	6.65	6.81
23	4.59	5.22	5.20	4.69
24	3.29	3.56	4.20	3.75
25	3.59	4.11	4.20	4.06
26	4.65	5.94	5.85	5.44
27	5.41	5.22	5.80	5.13
28	4.24	4.17	4.45	4.50

6A: n=17, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 26

MEAN SCORES FOR THE SCHOOL CLASSIFICATIONS
BUILDING REPRESENTATIVES OF TEACHER ORGANIZATION

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	2.06	2.17	1.80	2.13
2	6.18	6.11	5.05	6.19
3	5.18	5.39	5.10	4.19
4	4.53	4.28	4.85	5.25
5	5.06	5.83	4.95	5.38
6	6.41	6.61	5.95	6.00
7	6.29	6.39	6.00	5.38
8	3.35	3.27	3.75	3.44
9	5.35	5.50	5.30	4.63
10	5.06	4.94	4.95	4.94
11	6.41	6.22	6.40	5.69
12	6.29	6.28	6.40	5.81
13	6.71	6.72	6.25	6.56
14	5.82	5.39	5.50	6.06
15	5.76	5.94	5.95	5.81
16	5.59	5.11	5.65	5.44
17	4.71	5.22	5.55	4.88
18	6.82	6.83	6.60	6.56
19	3.82	3.72	4.20	3.75
20	4.94	5.44	5.55	5.31
21	6.41	6.44	6.60	6.69
22	4.82	5.00	5.60	5.19
23	3.18	3.06	2.35	2.81
24	1.47	1.56	2.40	2.06
25	1.94	1.94	2.15	2.69
26	3.35	3.39	4.55	4.19
27	5.41	4.67	4.55	3.75
28	5.29	4.67	5.85	5.56

6A: n=17, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 27

MEAN SCORES FOR THE SCHOOL CLASSIFICATIONS
PRINCIPALS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	1.56	1.50	2.00	2.06
2	6.00	5.83	6.25	6.06
3	5.50	5.83	4.75	5.25
4	4.83	4.72	5.45	4.69
5	5.89	5.61	5.10	4.25
6	6.28	6.39	6.00	6.35
7	5.83	5.33	5.10	5.56
8	2.89	3.94	3.65	2.38
9	4.56	5.89	4.60	4.94
10	4.50	4.67	5.00	5.19
11	5.94	6.22	6.10	6.00
12	5.83	5.94	6.05	6.25
13	6.11	5.72	6.05	6.50
14	5.28	4.33	5.40	5.56
15	6.28	5.28	5.75	5.13
16	5.44	5.61	5.85	5.94
17	4.72	5.44	5.30	5.31
18	6.67	6.56	6.55	6.69
19	4.33	4.22	4.05	3.50
20	5.56	4.83	5.15	5.81
21	6.67	6.33	6.65	6.63
22	5.83	5.50	5.60	6.00
23	2.89	3.33	2.95	3.19
24	1.72	2.44	1.65	1.88
25	2.06	2.78	2.10	2.13
26	4.83	5.28	5.20	4.56
27	5.39	5.06	5.95	5.06
28	4.17	4.17	4.60	5.38

6A: n=18, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 28

MEAN SCORES FOR THE SCHOOL CLASSIFICATIONS
SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	3.13	2.19	2.06	2.57
2	5.47	6.13	5.88	6.14
3	5.67	4.88	4.18	3.29
4	5.00	4.63	5.53	5.93
5	5.93	6.44	6.29	6.14
6	6.60	6.56	5.71	5.28
7	5.47	5.63	5.41	6.00
8	3.27	4.06	3.53	3.36
9	4.00	3.38	3.12	2.71
10	5.40	5.06	4.94	5.57
11	5.33	5.88	5.76	5.93
12	6.07	6.31	6.18	5.71
13	6.80	6.88	6.06	6.46
14	4.73	5.06	4.41	3.93
15	6.67	6.13	6.47	6.21
16	4.87	6.13	5.88	5.29
17	4.13	4.56	4.65	4.21
18	6.20	6.63	6.29	6.29
19	3.87	3.75	4.18	4.71
20	6.13	6.06	5.71	5.86
21	6.53	6.63	6.59	6.79
22	6.27	5.81	5.82	6.00
23	3.47	3.06	3.41	4.21
24	2.27	1.75	2.47	1.93
25	1.73	1.88	2.29	2.93
26	5.00	4.75	3.76	5.07
27	5.13	5.50	5.53	5.93
28	5.07	5.50	4.71	4.57

6A: n=15, 5A: n=16, 4A: n=17, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=14

When the 28 characteristics are ranked by mean scores, as to their importance (least to greatest), each group ranks the areas differently. Tables 29-32 show the rank order of importance (least to greatest) of each of the responding groups according to school classification by size.

TABLE 29

RANK ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINED BY MEAN SCORES OF STUDENT BODY PRESIDENTS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	8	12	14	2.5
2	9	8.5	4	13.5
3	14.5	17	16	9.5
4	21	18	23	26
5	2.5	11	15	2.5
6	23	21	20	17
7	11	15	19	20
8	1	1	1	1
9	12.5	4	2	7
10	4.5	10	7	13.5
11	18.5	14.5	11.5	23
12	18.5	13	11.5	19
13	25	25.5	25	23
14	17	8.5	8	18
15	20	22	17	15.5
16	15	14.5	9.5	12
17	4.5	5	13	8
18	26	24	26	23
19	6	2.5	3	5
20	24	25.5	22.5	25
21	28	28	28	27
22	27	27	27	28
23	12.5	19.5	18	11
24	2.5	2.5	5.5	4
25	7	6	5.5	6
26	14.5	23	23	21
27	21.5	19.5	21	15.5
28	10	7	9.5	9.5

6A: n=17, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 30

RANK ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINED BY MEAN SCORES OF BUILDING REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TEACHER ORGANIZATION

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	3	3	1	2
2	21	21	14.5	25
3	14	15.5	12	8.5
4	8	8	9	14
5	12.5	19	10.5	16.5
6	25	26	21.5	23
7	23	24	23	16.5
8	5.5	5	5	5
9	16	18	13	10
10	12.5	11	10.5	12
11	25	22	25.5	20
12	22	23	25.5	21.5
13	27	27	24	26.5
14	20	15.5	14.5	24
15	19	20	21.5	21.5
16	18	13	19	18
17	9	14	16.5	11
18	28	28	27.5	26.5
19	7	7	6	6.5
20	11	17	16.5	15
21	25	25	27.5	28
22	10	12	18	13
23	4	4	3	4
24	1	1	4	1
25	2	2	2	3
26	5.5	6	7.5	8.5
27	17	9.5	7.5	6.5
28	15	9.5	20	19

6A: n=17, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 31

RANK ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINED BY MEAN SCORES OF PRINCIPALS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	1	1	2	2
2	23	21.5	26	23
3	16	21.5	9	14
4	11.5	10	17	9
5	21	18.5	11.5	7
6	25.5	27	22	25
7	19	15	11.5	17.5
8	4.5	5	5	4
9	9	23	7.8	10
10	8	9	10	13
11	22	25	25	21.5
12	19	24	23.5	24
13	24	20	23.5	26
14	13	8	16	17.5
15	25.5	13.5	19	12
16	15	18.5	20	20
17	10	16	15	15
18	27.5	28	27	28
19	7	7	6	6
20	17	11	13	19
21	27.5	26	28	27
22	19	17	18	21.5
23	4.5	4	4	5
24	2	2	1	1
25	3	3	3	3
26	11.5	13.5	14	8
27	14	12	21	11
28	6	6	7.5	16

6A: n=18, 5A: n=18, 4A: n=20, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=16

TABLE 32

RANK ORDER FOR IMPORTANCE OF CHARACTERISTICS AS DETERMINED BY MEAN SCORES OF SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENTS

Characteristic	6A	5A	4A	3A, 2A, 1A
1	3	3	1	2
2	17.5	21	21.5	23.5
3	19	11	8.5	5
4	11.5	9	15.5	19
5	20	24	24.5	23.5
6	26	25	17.5	13
7	17.5	16	14	21.5
8	4	7	6	6
9	7	5	4	3
10	16	12.5	13	15
11	15	18	19	19
12	21	23	23	16
13	28	28	26	27
14	9	12.5	10	7
15	27	21	27	25
16	10	21	21.5	14
17	8	8	11	8.5
18	23	26.5	24.5	26
19	6	6	8.5	11
20	22	19	17.5	17
21	25	26.5	28	28
22	24	17	20	21.5
23	5	4	5	8.5
24	2	1	3	1
25	1	2	2	4
26	11.5	10	7	12
27	14	14.5	15.5	19
28	13	14.5	12	10

6A: n=15, 5A: n=16, 4A: n=17, 3A, 2A, 1A: n=14

As indicated by the data listed in the tables, there was never a significant difference found when making comparisons within the groups as broken down by school size. In each of the areas tested, using the appropriate degrees of freedom, the F ratio had to be 8.57 or greater to indicate a significant difference.

The largest F ratio found in the student body president respondents was 2.89. This ratio was found when the student group responded to if the school should contact parents that fail to report student absences. This topic raised the most difference in opinion, but it fell far short of the 8.57 required to indicate significant differences. Only in 2 other instances did the F ratio even exceed the 2.00 mark. An example of the closeness of thought of this group can be seen in that in 18 of the 29 characteristics, the F ratio failed to even reach the 1.00 mark.

The teacher group had the largest difference in perception about the idea that incentive programs should be offered to encourage good student attendance. The F ratio reached on this characteristic was 2.97. Again this number was far short of the 8.57 mark required. It is again interesting to note that on 18 of the 28 characteristics, an F ratio of 1.00 could not be reached.

A look at the F ratios for the principal group shows a maximum score of 2.73. Like the student group, this F ratio was found when testing the characteristic that the school should contact the parents should they fail to report student absences. As in the other examples, a score of 2.73 fell far short of the 8.57 required score. The principal group had 16 of 28 F ratios fall below the 1.00 mark.

The school board president group had the greatest amount of differences of any group surveyed. The characteristic dealing with it being the students responsibility to obtain work missed due to excused absences resulted in an F ratio of 6.34. This score was as close to the 8.57 required score as could be found in any other group. This group had 3 F ratios that exceeded the 3.00 mark and a total of 6 F ratios that were in excess of the 2.00 mark. Even though there was a greater range of differences, this group still had 16

of 28 F ratios that were less than 1.00.

The data obtained when making comparisons within the individual groups indicates that the groups tested had consistent perceptions toward the 28 characteristics found in attendance policies of the state of Kansas.

SUMMARY OF DATA

In summary, significant differences were found to exist between how the student body presidents, building representatives of the teacher organization, principals, and school board presidents perceived the various characteristics found in attendance policies of the state of Kansas. It is interesting to note that in 19 of 20 instances where there was a significant difference between perceptions of the characteristics found in attendance policies in the state of Kansas, the difference was between a student under the jurisdiction of the guidelines and an adult not under the jurisdiction of the guidelines. The greatest number of significant differences, 9 of 20, were found to be between student body presidents and building representatives of the teacher organization. On characteristics 1, 2, 24, and 25 a significant difference was found to exist between the student body president group and each of the building representatives of the teacher organization group, principal group, and school board president group.

There was no significant difference found to exist between how the various characteristics found in the attendance policies of high schools in the state of Kansas are perceived within individual groups as broken down by school classification (6A; 5A; 4A; and the group made up of 3A, 2A, and 1A).